

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-37, and amended claims 1, 14, and 27 are in this application.

An interview between Examiner Truong and Dennis Smid (one of the applicants' undersigned attorneys) was held at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on February 2, 2006. The applicants and Mr. Smid wish to thank the Examiner for her time and consideration for such interview.

Claims 1-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,931,947) in view of Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,516), and further in view of Houvener et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,070,141).

Each of the independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 14, and 27) has been amended herein as discussed during the February 2 interview. For example, independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"wherein the data enciphered on the basis of said second identification data is transmittable by way of said second transmitting/receiving unit to said first transmitting/receiving unit of the respective user machine and is decodable by said first signal processing unit,

. . . , and

wherein the second identification data is not transmitted between the respective user machine and the contents server or between the contents server and the respective user machine." (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, in the system of claim 1 and as discussed during the February 2 interview, the second identification data which may be used to encipher the data is not transmitted

between the respective user machine and the contents server or visa versa. As an example, the second identification data may be the so-called M key described in the present application.

Therefore, and as discussed during the February 2 interview, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 as presented herein is distinguishable from the applied combination of Burns et al., Cooper, and Houvener.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, the applicants also respectfully submit that independent claims 14 and 27 as presented herein are distinguishable from the applied combination of Burns et al., Cooper, and Houvener.

Claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-37 are dependent from one of independent claims 1, 14, and 27. Accordingly, the applicants also respectfully submit that claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-37 as presented herein are distinguishable from the applied combination of Burns et al., Cooper, and Houvener for at least the reasons previously described.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 09/462,615

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-1233

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants

621920\_1.DOC